

### REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the non-final Office Action mailed April 14, 2003 (Paper No. 12). Reexamination and reconsideration in light of the above amendments and following remarks are courteously requested.

Claims 1-9 remain pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 2 being the independent claims. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended, and Claim 10 has been canceled herein. No new matter is believed to have been added.

#### Election/Restriction

Independent Claim 10, which was newly presented in the previous amendment, was subject to a Restriction by original presentation and was withdrawn from consideration. In response, Applicant has canceled independent Claim 10 herein, without prejudice or disclaimer.

#### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S. C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,453,235 (Endo et al.), and Claims 1, 2, and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S. C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,212,132 (Yamane et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed, at least in light of the above amendments.

Independent Claim 1 relates to a method for displaying navigational data associated with an aircraft on a display having a display coordinate system that includes providing one or more databases, each database including navigational data stored as geospatially organized data structures, retrieving data from one or more of said databases, projecting and culling the retrieved data to a current display range, and recites, *inter alia*, updating, in real-time, a projected display database that substantially maintains correct projections of the projected and culled data from latitude and longitude coordinates to Cartesian coordinates.

Independent Claim 2 relates to a display system that includes a display computer coupled to a display having a display coordinate system and to at least one database including navigational data stored as geospatially organized data structures that include data representative of latitude and longitude coordinates. The display computer is configured to project and cull geospatially organized data structures retrieved from each database to a current display range.

Independent Claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, that the display computer is further operable to “update, in real-time, a projected display database that substantially maintains correct projections of the projected and culled data from latitude and longitude coordinates to Cartesian coordinates.”

Endo et al. relates to a navigational aid that is used to guide a motor vehicle to a destination by displaying a guide picture on a display. The system includes a navigation controller (1), a remote controller (2), and a display (3). The navigation system includes a CD-ROM drive (5) to read data from a CD-ROM (4) that has map data stored thereon, and a GPS receiver (6) to receive signals used to determine the vehicle’s present location and bearing. The navigation controller (1), among other things, retrieves map data from the CD-ROM (4) based on the present position of the vehicle. A map buffer (12) stores the map data read from the CD-ROM (4), and a map drawing section (13) generates a map image using the stored data. The generated map image is then stored in VRAM (14). Nowhere does Endo et al. disclose, or even remotely suggest, that the generated map image stored in the VRAM (or any other component for that matter) maintains correct projections of the projected and culled data from latitude and longitude coordinates to Cartesian coordinates, as recited in independent Claims 1 and 2.

Yamane et al. relates to a three-dimensional radar system that includes a radar transceiver (14), a display unit (15), a three-dimensional polygon-generating unit (16), and a three-dimensional graphics unit (18). Among other things, Yamane et al. discloses a map database (28) connected to the three-dimensional polygon-generating unit (16). The polygon-generating unit (16) includes a polygon processing section (3) that performs polygon-generating processing for respective picture element data of a two-dimensional radar image, and a polygon buffer (34) for holding polygon data processed by the polygon processing section (30).

However, similar to Endo et al., Yamane et al., also fails to disclose or suggest, at least the above-noted features of independent Claims 1 and 2. Namely, Yamane et al. fails to disclose or suggest at least maintaining correct projections of the projected and culled data from latitude and longitude coordinates to Cartesian coordinates.

Hence, it is submitted that both Endo et al. and Yamane et al. fail to disclose, or even remotely suggest, at least the above-noted feature recited in independent Claims 1 and 2. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(e) rejections is respectfully solicited.

### Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Endo et al., Claims 1, 2, and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Yamane et al., Claims 1, and 3-5 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Nos. 5,920,276 (Frederick) and 6,199,008 (Aratow et al.), and Claims 2, and 6-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Frederick, and U.S. Patent No. 5,978,715 (Briffe et al.). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

First, as was noted above with respect to the § 102(e) rejections, both Endo et al. and Yaamane et al. fail to disclose or suggest at least one of the features of independent Claims 1 and 2. Hence, for at least this same reason, independent Claims 1 and 2 are not rendered obvious by either of these citations.

With respect to Frederick, this citation relates to a weather radar and terrain map display for aircraft, and discloses transmitting and receiving radar signals, digitizing reflected radar signals, and a computer for calculating the latitude and longitude coordinates of the locations from which the signals were reflected. The system provides a plan view image showing weather conditions superimposed over terrain contours and map data. Although the system includes a special purpose processor (80) that provides latitude and longitudinal grid lines for display on a display screen, Frederick is not understood to disclose or suggest at least the above noted features of independent Claims 1 and 2. Namely, Frederick fails to disclose or suggest at least a projected display database that substantially maintains correct projections of the projected and culled data from latitude and longitude coordinates to Cartesian coordinates.

Aratow et al. relates to an aviation, terrain, air traffic, and weather display system that displays data useful for pilots, and Briffe et al. relates to an improved aircraft control interface and display. However, neither of these citations is understood to make up for at least the above-noted deficiency of Frederick. Namely, neither Aratow et al. nor Briffe et al. disclose or suggest at least a projected display database that substantially maintains correct projections of the projected and culled data from latitude and longitude coordinates to Cartesian coordinates.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections is respectfully solicited.

Conclusion

Based on the above, independent Claims 1 and 2 are patentable over the citations of record. The dependent claims 3-9 are also submitted to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to independent Claims 1 and 2, and because each recites features which are patentable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully solicited.

The other art of record is also not understood to disclose or suggest the inventive concept of the present invention as defined by the claims.

Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections and rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowance are requested.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions that could place this application in even better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the below-listed number.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 14, 2003

By: 

Paul D. Amrozowicz  
Reg. No. 45,264  
(480) 385-5060

Ingrassia Fisher & Lorenz  
Customer No. 29906